

CP Violation in EPR-like neutrino oscillations

M K Samal*

Institute of Physics, Sachivalaya Marg, Bhubaneswar 751 005, India.

After reviewing the general framework to study EPR-like neutrino oscillations, we derive expressions for the oscillation probabilities and a direct measure of CP violation. We compare the possibility of studying CP violation in this case with that of baseline accelerator experiments and conclude that it is possible to study CP violation in experiments with length scales comparable to that of short baseline accelerator experiments.

PACS No: 14.60.pq

(Pre-print No: IP/BBSR/97-18, April 1997; hep-ph/9707255.)

Although the origin of CP violation is yet to be understood, the Standard Model incorporates CP violation in the quark sector through the phase of CKM [1] mixing matrix. There is no such effect in its lepton sector because neutrinos are massless by construct. However, at present the experiments involving solar neutrinos and/or atmospheric neutrinos and the necessity of a hot component in the favoured mixed Dark matter scenario indicate that neutrinos may possess a small mass. In such a case, one would expect CP violation in massive neutrino oscillations, whose experimental verification can help us understand the symmetry between the quark sector and the lepton sector of the standard model. Moreover, it is also suggested [2] that CP violation in lepton sector constitutes one of the key ingredients of the mechanism for generating baryon asymmetry in the universe.

The possibility of measuring CP violation in baseline accelerator neutrino oscillations experiments has been analysed by various authors in recent studies [3]. Though this CP violating effect is suppressed in the short baseline accelerator experiments if neutrinos have hierarchical mass spectrum, it was pointed out that the suppression is avoidable in the long baseline accelerator experiments, which is expected to operate in the near future [4]. However, the potential obstacle in measuring CP violation in long-baseline neutrino experiments is the contamination due to the matter effect. Since the earth matter is not CP symmetric it can not only produce fake CP violation which acts as contamination but also can dominate over the CP phase effect in a certain region of the mixing parameters in the $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ experiments [5].

Hence it is reasonable to look for the possibility of studying CP violation in any other experiments involving neutrino oscillations. Recently it was suggested [6] that in coincidence experiments, in which both the charged lepton and neutrino, born in the same decay, are detected; specific EPR-like neutrino oscillations [7] can show up. Beginning with the suggestions [8] of using EPR-like effects to obtain information about particle properties: the ϵ' parameter of K^0 decays and CP violation in the B meson systems, the study of EPR correlations has evolved from an illustration of some of the surprising features of quantum mechanics to a practical tool for determining physical parameters [9]. In this paper we study leptonic CP violation in such a scenario.

In the following, after reviewing the general framework to study EPR-like neutrino oscillations [6], we derive expressions for the oscillation probabilities and a direct measure of CP violation using the modified Maiani representation advocated by Particle Data Group [10]. Then we discuss the possibility of studying CP violation in this case and compare it with that of Base Line accelerator experiments. We conclude that it is possible to study CP violation in experiments with length scales comparable to that of short baseline accelerator experiments.

If the neutrino mass matrix is not flavour diagonal then the flavour neutrinos ν_l ($l = e, \mu, \tau$) are non-trivial mixtures of the mass eigenstates ν_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) with non-degenerate masses:

$$\nu_l = \sum_j U_{lj} \nu_j. \quad (1)$$

We consider the decay $\pi \rightarrow \mu\nu$ and the relevant part of the standard model Lagrangian consists of the charged-current terms:

$$\mathcal{L}_\nu = g \sum_l \bar{l} \hat{W} \nu_l + H.c. = g \sum_{l,j} U_{lj} \bar{l} \hat{W} \nu_j + H.c. \quad (2)$$

We assume that all particles are on the mass shell:

*e-mail:mksamal@iopb.ernet.in

$$p_\pi = m_\pi^2, p_{\mu_j}^2 = m_\mu^2, p_{\nu_j} = m_\nu^2, \quad (3)$$

and the pion has a definite 4-momentum $p_\pi = (E_\pi, \mathbf{p}_\pi)$ such that the conservation law:

$$p_\pi = p_{\mu_j} + p_{\nu_j}, \quad (4)$$

alongwith the direction of, say, $\mathbf{p}_{\nu_j}$ determines the 4-momenta $p_{\mu_j} = (E_{\mu_j}, \mathbf{p}_{\mu_j})$ and $p_{\nu_j} = (E_{\nu_j}, \mathbf{p}_{\nu_j})$.

We analyse the type of experiments when both neutrino and muon are detected. The probability to detect both muon μ and neutrino ν as oscillating functions of the distance d between the muon and neutrino detection points x_μ and x_ν respectively, of the time interval Δt between “clicks” of the two detector and the neutrino mixing matrix elements is given as

$$P_{\nu_l}(x_\mu, x_\nu) = |\mathcal{A}_{\nu_l}(x_\mu, x_\nu)|^2, \quad (5)$$

where the amplitude to detect a muon at a space-time point x_μ together with a neutrino of flavour l at a point x_ν is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\nu_l}(x_\mu, x_\nu) = \langle \mu; \nu_l | \psi_{p_\pi}(x_\mu, x_\nu) \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where ψ_{p_π} is the wavefunction of the $\mu\nu$ system.

For the two generations of Dirac neutrinos, the mixing matrix is devoid of any CP violating phase and the wavefunction of the $\mu\nu$ system evolves in space-time [6]

$$\psi_{p_\pi}(x_\mu, x_\nu | x_i) = |\mu \rangle (|\nu_1 \rangle e^{-i\phi_1} \cos \theta + |\nu_2 \rangle e^{-i\phi_2} \sin \theta), \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= p_{\nu_1}(x_\nu - x_i) + p_{\mu_1}(x_\mu - x_i), \\ \phi_2 &= p_{\nu_2}(x_\nu - x_i) + p_{\mu_2}(x_\mu - x_i), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and $|\mu \rangle$, $|\nu_1 \rangle$ and $|\nu_2 \rangle$ are state vectors of the muon μ and neutrino mass eigenstates ν_1 and ν_2 respectively. The space-time co-ordinates of muon and neutrino are x_μ and x_ν respectively whereas x_i is the co-ordinate of the decay point. The muons emitted together with the ν_1 and ν_2 have respective momentum p_{μ_1} and p_{μ_2} . In this case the probability of detecting a ν_μ is [6]

$$P_{\nu_\mu}(x_\mu, x_\nu) = \cos^4 \theta + \sin^4 \theta + 2 \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2). \quad (9)$$

where

$$(\phi_1 - \phi_2) = (p_{\nu_1} - p_{\nu_2})(x_\nu - x_\mu), \quad (10)$$

and the equality $(p_{\nu_1} - p_{\nu_2}) = -(p_{\mu_1} - p_{\mu_2})$ has been used to get the above expression. Similarly if the neutrino is detected to be ν_e

$$P_{\nu_e}(x_\mu, x_\nu) = 2 \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \theta \{1 - \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2)\}. \quad (11)$$

The probability oscillates in space and time with the change of x_μ and/or x_ν , presenting a kind of EPR effect. As we will see later, oscillation length and oscillation frequency are different from the standard values $L = 2E_\nu/(m_1^2 - m_2^2)$ and L^{-1} respectively.

For the case of three generations of neutrinos, the probability (5) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\nu_\ell}(x_\mu, x_\nu) &= \left| \sum_j U_{\ell j} U_{\mu j}^* e^{-i\phi_j} \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_j |U_{\ell j}|^2 |U_{\mu j}|^2 + 2 \sum_{j < k} \text{Re} (U_{\ell j} U_{\mu j}^* U_{\ell k}^* U_{\mu k}) \cos \phi_{jk} + 2 \sum_{j < k} \text{Im} (U_{\ell j} U_{\mu j}^* U_{\ell k}^* U_{\mu k}) \sin \phi_{jk}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\phi_{jk} = (\phi_j - \phi_k)$. The structure of the oscillation formula is the same as that of standard neutrino oscillations except for the nature of the phase. Before we get into the detailed discussion of the phase ϕ_{jk} note that the coefficient of the $\sin \phi_{jk}$ in eqn. (12) is $2J$, where J is the rephasing invariant Jarlskog's plaquette [11] that is a measure of CP violation. To isolate this term, it is easy to observe that

$$P_{\nu_\ell} \left(x_\mu, x_\nu; \phi_{jk} = \frac{3\pi}{2} \right) - P_{\nu_\ell} \left(x_\mu, x_\nu; \phi_{jk} = \frac{\pi}{2} \right) = 4J. \quad (13)$$

Therefore measurement of $P_{\nu_\ell} (x_\mu, x_\nu; \phi_{jk} = \frac{3\pi}{2})$ and $P_{\nu_\ell} (x_\mu, x_\nu; \phi_{jk} = \frac{\pi}{2})$ can yield J .

The representation of the unitary mixing matrix depends on the type of neutrinos. Majorana neutrinos can have three non-zero CP phases whereas Dirac neutrinos can have only one CP phase. But it was shown [12] that it is not possible to distinguish experimentally between Dirac and Majorana neutrinos using neutrino oscillations. It is convenient to describe the neutrino mixing matrix by the modified Maiani representation advocated by Particle Data Group [10]:

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{13}s_{23}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{13}s_{23}e^{i\delta} & c_{13}s_{23} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}s_{13}c_{23}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}s_{13}c_{23}e^{i\delta} & c_{13}c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

where $s_{jk} \equiv \sin \theta_{jk}$, $c_{jk} \equiv \cos \theta_{jk}$. In this parametrization, the expression for the probability of the neutrino being a ν_e is found out to be

$$P_{\nu_e}(x_\mu, x_\nu) = P_0 + P_1 + P_2 + P_3, \quad (15)$$

where the coefficients P_0 , P_1 , P_2 and P_3 are functions of angles and phases δ and ϕ_{jk} as:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= c_{13}^2 [2c_{12}^2 c_{23}^2 s_{12}^2 + 2c_{12}^4 s_{13}^2 s_{23}^2 + (1 + 2s_{12}^4) s_{13}^2 s_{23}^2 + 2c_{12}c_{23}s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}(c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) \\ &\quad + 2c_{12}^2 s_{12}^2 (s_{13}^2 s_{23}^2 - c_{23}^2) \cos \phi_{12}], \\ P_1 &= 2c_{13}^2 c_{12}c_{23}s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}(\cos \delta)[(s_{12}^2 - c_{12}^2) \cos \phi_{12} - \cos \phi_{13} + \cos \phi_{23}], \\ P_2 &= -c_{13}^2 s_{13}^2 s_{23}^2 (\cos 2\delta)[c_{12}^2 \cos \phi_{13} + s_{12}^2 \cos \phi_{23}], \\ P_3 &= 2c_{13}^2 c_{12}c_{23}s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}(\sin \delta)[\sin \phi_{12} - \sin \phi_{13} + \sin \phi_{23}] = J[\sin \phi_{12} - \sin \phi_{13} + \sin \phi_{23}]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

It is easy to check that the above expression reduces to the eqn.(11) if one puts $s_{23} = s_{13} \rightarrow 0$ and $c_{23} = c_{13} \rightarrow 1$ and $s_{12} \equiv \sin \theta$. This probabilities oscillate not only with the differences $(\mathbf{x}_\mu - \mathbf{x}_\nu) \equiv d$ and $(t_\mu - t_\nu) \equiv \Delta t$ but also with the CP phase δ . The fluctuation of the envelope of this probability with the KM phase δ can perhaps be observed in experiments [13].

To see the difference in the nature of phases, note that for standard neutrino oscillations the phase ϕ_{jk} is given as

$$\phi_{jk} = \frac{(m_j^2 - m_k^2)L}{2E} = 2.5 \left(\frac{\delta m_{jk}^2}{10^{-2} \text{ eV}^2} \right) \left(\frac{L}{100 \text{ km}} \right) \left(\frac{E}{1 \text{ GeV}} \right)^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

where L and E are the source to detector distance and neutrino energy respectively; whereas in the case of EPR-like neutrino oscillations [6]

$$\phi_{jk} = \frac{\delta m_{jk}^2}{2E} t_{\nu i}, \quad (18)$$

where $t_{\nu i}$ is the difference between the time of creation (i.e. the time of pion decay) and the time of detection for the neutrino in natural units. The phase does not depend on $t_{\mu i}$ and thus the above probability simply describes the neutrino oscillations from the point of creation of the neutrino till the point of its detection. Accordingly they do not depend on the position of the muon detector. Therefore EPR-like correlations between muon and neutrino detection appear only when the time $t_{\nu i}$ is expressed in terms of $\Delta t = t_\nu - t_\mu$ and $d = x_\mu - x_\nu$. If one assumes that a special detector measures the decay point of pion x_i then the situation becomes absolutely trivial.

To express $t_{\nu i}$ in terms of Δt , consider a beam of pions moving from left to right along the line which connects the muon and neutrino detectors. At fixed distance between the detectors (d), the measurement of Δt (time difference between the clicks of the two detectors) allow one to find the space-time point x_i of the pion. Thus for a pion with velocity $v_\pi > v_\mu^0$ (the muon velocity in pions rest frame) decaying to the left of the muon detector we have [6] in the collinear case,

$$t_{\nu i} = \frac{-v_\mu \Delta t + d}{v_\nu - v_\mu}. \quad (19)$$

On the otherhand a pion with velocity $v_\pi < v_\mu^0$, decaying between the two detectors

$$t_{\nu i} = \frac{v_\mu \Delta t + d}{v_\nu + v_\mu}. \quad (20)$$

A direct measure of CP violation in three-neutrino oscillations is the unique difference of the transition probabilities between CP-conjugate channels [14]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P &\equiv P(\bar{\nu}_\mu - \bar{\nu}_e) - P(\nu_\mu - \nu_e) = P(\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau) - P(\bar{\nu}_\mu - \bar{\nu}_\tau) = P(\bar{\nu}_e - \bar{\nu}_\tau) - P(\nu_e - \nu_\tau) \\ &= 4JS, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the contribution from the mixing matrix is in terms of J and the squared mass differences contribute through the term $S = \sum_{j < k} \sin \phi_{jk}$. To estimate ΔP one uses the clues about the J and S from the experiments regarding neutrino masses and mixing.

There are only two hierarchical mass difference scales δm^2 in the three-flavour mixing scheme. If the highest neutrino mass scale is taken to be $O(1 \text{ eV})$, which is appropriate for cosmological hot dark matter [15], the other mass scale is either the atmospheric neutrino mass scale $\delta m^2 \simeq 10^{-2} \text{ eV}^2$ or the solar neutrino mass scale $\delta m^2 \simeq 10^{-5} \sim 10^{-6} \text{ eV}^2$. The lower mass scale is chosen to be $\delta m^2 \simeq 10^{-2} \text{ eV}^2$ for studies of CP violation in long baseline experiments as they correspond to the atmospheric neutrino mass scale. Then, one should introduce the sterile neutrino to solve the solar neutrino puzzle via neutrino oscillations. However, all the neutrino data can be consistent with an almost degenerate neutrinos scenario and CP violation in this case has been studied [17]. Once the neutrino mass scales are fixed, one can discuss the pattern of the 3×3 neutrino mixing matrix. In general, there are three allowed regions of the mixings, which are derived from the reactor and accelerator disappearance experiments and J is estimated [18] accordingly.

In the case of EPR-like oscillations, one gets the same J contribution as that of standard oscillations, but a different contribution for S . In standard oscillations, one obtains for short baseline experiments $\phi_{31} \simeq -\phi_{12} = O(1)$ if $\Delta m_{31}^2 = O(1 \text{ eV}^2)$. The factor S is suppressed because the two largest terms almost cancel each other due to their opposite signs and the term containing ϕ_{23} is small. Due to this significant reduction of the term S it is argued that one has no chance to observe CP violation in the short baseline neutrino oscillation experiments. However, the situation is different in the long baseline accelerator experiments. Since the magnitude of $\phi_{31} (\simeq -\phi_{12})$ is $10^3 \sim 10^4$, the terms containing them average out to be zero, but at the same time the term containing ϕ_{23} is $O(1)$. Thus the quantity ΔP is not suppressed unless J is too small.

To discuss the contributions to S in the case of EPR-like oscillations, let us note that the energy scale involved is of tens of MeV. Hence for the neutrino mass hierarchy chosen above, S will get a substantial contribution through ϕ_{23} if $t_{\nu i}$ can be hundreds of meters. For the case $v_\pi < v_\mu^0$ this can be achieved by choosing the separation between the detectors (d) to be few hundreds of meters, which is the same scale as short baseline experiments. But in the case of pion with $v_\pi > v_\mu^0$, this can be achieved with d of tens of meters because for the ultra-relativistic muons with the denominator in the expression (19) could be very small and hence $t_{\nu i}$ can be enhanced. But if the numerator in this case is also very small then the contribution to S gets suppressed.

To conclude, we have shown that unlike the case of base line neutrino oscillation experiments, it is possible to study CP violation in EPR-like neutrino oscillations experiments with length scales comparable to that of short base line experiments. Hence in this case one does not have to bother about the contamination due to matter effect. We also give the expressions for the oscillation probabilities whose envelopes' fluctuation with the KM phase δ can tell us about the magnitude of CP violation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Subhendra Mohanty for drawing my attention to ref. [6] and for discussions. I am thankful to Theory Group at Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad for local hospitality during a visit when this work was initiated. It is a pleasure to thank the referee for useful comments.

-
- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10** (1963) 531; M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49** (1972) 652.
 - [2] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. **B 174**, 45 (1986).
 - [3] M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. **D 55** 322 (1997); H. Minakata and H. Nunokawa, preprint hep-ph/9705208; M. Koike and J. Sato, preprint hep-ph/9707203.

- [4] S. Parke, in Perspectives in Neutrinos, Atomic Physics, and Gravitation, Proceedings of the 28th Rencontre de Moriond, Villars sur Ollon, Switzerland, 1993, edited by J. Tran Thanh Van et al. (Editions Frontieres, Gif-sur-Yvette, France, 1993); S. Wojcicki, presented at the XVII th Conf. on Neutrino Physics and Neutrino Astrophysics, Helsinki, Finland, 1996 (unpublished); Y. Suzuki (KEK), invited talk at the XVII th Conf. on Neutrino Physics and Neutrino Astrophysics, Helsinki, Finland, 1996 (unpublished).
- [5] T. K. Kuo and J. Pantaleone, Phys. Lett. **B 198**, 406 (1987); P. I. Krastev and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. **B 205**, 84 (1988); and ref.(3).
- [6] A. D. Dolgov, A. Yu. Morozov, O. B. Okun, M. G. Schepkin, *Do Muons oscillate ?*, hep-ph/9702241.
- [7] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev., **47** (1935) 777.
- [8] H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. **176** (1968) 1715; I. Dunietz, J. Hauser and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. **D 35** (1987) 2166.
- [9] A. Datta and D. Home, Phys. Lett. **A 119** (1986) 3; B. Kayser and L. Stodolsky, Phys. Lett. **B 359** (1995) 343; R. A. Bertlmann and W. Grimus, Phys. Lett. **B 392** (1997) 426.
- [10] Review of Particle Properties by Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D 54** (1996) 1.
- [11] C. Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55** (1985) 1839.
- [12] B. Kayser, S. M. Bilenky, J. Hosek, and S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. **B 94**, 495 (1980).
- [13] S. P. Denisov, Proc. of the Intern. Workshop on New Detectors in Neutrino Physics, Fermilab, 1988, p. 207; F. Sergiampietri et al., Proc. of the 4th Intern. Conf. on Calorimetry in High Energy Physics, Italy, 1993, p. 357.
- [14] S. Pakvasa, in *High Energy Physics-1980* Proc. of the XXth Intern. Conf., Madison, Wisconsin, 1980, edited by L. Durand and L. G. Pondrom, AIP Conf. Proc. No. 68 (AIP, New York, 1981), Vol. 2, p. 1165; V. Barger, K. Whisnant, and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 2084 (1980); Phys. rev. D **23** 2773 (1981); S. M. Bilenky and F. Niedermaler, Sov. J. Nucl. Physc **34**, 606 (1981).
- [15] C. Y. Cardell and G. M. Fuller, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 4421 and references therein.
- [16] K. S. Hirata et. al, Phys. Lett. **B 205**, 416 (1988); *ibid.* **B 280**, 146 (1992); Y. Fukuda et al., Phys. Lett. **B 335**, 237 (1994).
- [17] J. Arafune and J. Sato, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 1653.
- [18] M. Tanimoto, preprint hep-ph/9612444.